

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 6 are re-presented and, new claims 7 – 9 have been added.

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0012425). Suzuki et al. uses lenticular lenses 220, 230. Suzuki et al. in Fig. 15 discloses rows of designs printed on planar surface 240. Applicant claims a non-planar surface in all claims. This difference is important as it is the non-planar surface that creates the 3D effect. None of the prior art discloses objects printed on a non-planar surface. Perhaps Examiner is arguing that the two surfaces 210 and 240 combined create, in effect, a non-planar surface. The image viewed in Suzuki et al. is created by a portion of each planar image. While it is true that the surfaces 210 and 240 are not co-planar, they are not part of the same surface and therefore does not combine to form a non-planar surface as claimed.

Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify that the non-planar surface has curvature. It is the surface curvature that creates a different 3D effect than was possible with prior art 2D free form printing such as that shown by Sussman (U.S. Patent No. 5,641,289).

Claims 2 – 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Sussman. Neither Suzuki et al. nor Sussman disclose indicia of any type printed on a non-planar surface to create an illusion of floating text as claimed. Thus the combination of Suzuki et al. in view of Sussman fails to show the devices claimed. Further, if Suzuki et al., which works with lenticular lenses 220, were modified by Sussman's teaching to place the images in staggered columns, the resulting device would not function at all. Suzuki et al. requires identical patterns laid out in a checkerboard pattern as shown in Fig. 15 referenced by Examiner.

Applicant has added new claims 7 – 9 which depend from independent claim 6. Claim 7 clarifies that the non-planar surface is a cylinder, which as previously discussed, is not shown in any of the prior art. Claim 8 clarifies that the images are first printed on a flat

surface, see Fig. 4, and then wrapped onto the non-planar surface. Claim 9 clarifies simply that the non-planar surface has curvature. Again, this is not shown in the prior art of record.

For these reasons, it is felt that all claims now distinguish over the prior art or record.

CONCLUSION

Based on the remarks above it is felt that claims 1 - 9 now distinguish over the prior art of record, and are now in condition for allowance.

In the event the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this response, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

by: 

Gary K. Price, #45,024

BOWERS HARRISON, LLP
GARY K. PRICE, ESQ
25 N W RIVERSIDE DRIVE
P O BOX 1287
EVANSVILLE, IN 47706-1287
TELEPHONE: (812) 426-1231
FACSIMILE: (812) 464-367